

REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the final Office Action dated December 29, 2009, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 18-23 are pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claims 18, 22 and 23 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

As a preliminary matter, the Examiner has not acknowledged the Applicants' claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119 by checking the boxes in item 12 and item 12a on page 1 of the Office Action. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner acknowledge the Applicants' claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119 (i.e., item 12) and receipt of all priority documents (i.e., 12a) in the next Office communication.

In the Office Action, claims 18-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jouet et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,030,890, hereafter "Jouet").

The Applicants have amended independent claim 18, 22 and 23 in order to more clearly distinguish the present invention from the cited prior art. Independent claim 18 (as amended) recites the following features:

"[a] display process apparatus comprising:
an application;
a device resource which is another application;
a display screen;
a GUI player configured to display, on said display screen, a GUI content used by said application; and

a conversion section configured to, by using a conversion rule, convert from a screen event related to the GUI content displayed on said display screen by said GUI player into a device event interpretable for said device resource, the conversion rule associating the screen event related to the GUI content with the device event interpretable for said device resource,

wherein the device resource reports, to said application, a result of interpretation executed based on the device event converted by said conversation section, and

the application processes the screen event related to said GUI player in accordance with the result of interpretation reported from said device resource." (Emphasis added).

The features emphasized above in independent claim 18 are similarly recited in independent claims 22 and 23 (as amended). That is, independent claim 22 is a corresponding method and claim 23 is a corresponding program; and both claims recite steps directed to the apparatus of independent claim 18. Additionally, the features emphasized above in independent claim 18 (and similarly recited in independent claims 22 and 23) are fully supported by the Applicants' disclosure (e.g., ¶¶ [0034] - ¶ [0039]; and Fig. 7).

The present invention (as recited in independent claim 18, 22 and 23) is distinguishable from the cited prior art in that a conversion rule is implemented for converting a screen event (i.e., an event related to a GUI content) into a device event (i.e., an event interpretable for an application). Accordingly, a device resource, which was originally inaccessible from a GUI player, now becomes accessible (see ¶ [0035]). With the present invention (as recited in independent claim 18, 22 and 23), the conversion rule is previously set so it is possible to allow a system to use the GUI content and the GUI player, which were originally prepared for another system, without changing the application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on Jouet for disclosing or suggesting all the features recited in independent claims 18, 22 and 23. However, the Applicants assert that Jouet fails to disclose or suggest all the features now recited in independent claims 18, 22 and 23 (as amended). In particular, Jouet fails to implement the use of "a conversion rule," as recited in independent claims 18, 22 and 23.

Jouet discloses a method for controlling the appearance of a graphical object in a graphical user interface. As described in Jouet, an object in a graphical user interface includes a widget class which defines properties for controlling the operation of the object; and an associated look object class which defines properties for controlling the look of the object.

However, the method in Jouet fails to disclose the ability to use GUI content and a GUI player, which was prepared for another system, without changing an application. That is, Jouet neither discloses nor suggests the use of a conversion rule for converting a screen event (i.e., event related to GUI content) into a device event interpretable for any application.

With the present invention (as recited in independent claims 18, 22 and 23), a conversion rule is implemented for converting a screen event (i.e., an event related to GUI content) into a device event (i.e., an event interpretable for an application). Accordingly, a device resource, which was originally inaccessible from a GUI player, now becomes accessible.

Under 35 U.S.C. 102 “a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). As noted above, Jouet fails to disclose at least the use of the “conversion rule” as recited in independent claims 18, 22 and 23. For at least this reasons, Jouet fails to anticipate independent claims 18, 22 and 23 (as amended). Moreover, Jouet fails to anticipate claims 19-21 at least by virtue of their dependencies from independent claim 18.

Moreover, the Applicants assert that dependent claims 19-21 are distinguishable from Jouet on their own merit. Specifically, claims 19-21 recite additional features related to the use of a “conversion rule”

For example, claim 19 recites that “the display process apparatus modifies said GUI player by updating the conversion rule to another conversion rule.” (Emphasis added). Dependent claim 20 recites that “the display process apparatus further obtains another GUI player and another conversion rule, and updates the conversion rule to said another conversion rule that has been obtained, and modifies said GUI player to said another GUI player, by using the other conversion rule.” (Emphasis added). And, claim 21 recites that “the display process apparatus obtains the other GUI player and the other conversion rule via a network.” (Emphasis added).

As noted above, Jouet fails to disclose at least the use of the “conversion rule.” Accordingly, dependent claims 19-21 are distinguished from Jouet on their own merit.

In the Office Action, claim 21 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jouet in view of Najmi (U.S. Patent No. 6,959,304, hereafter “Najmi”).

Claim 21 depends (i.e., indirectly) from independent claim 18. As noted above, Jouet fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in independent claim 18. Moreover, Najmi fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Jouet. That is, Najmi also fails to disclose or suggest the use of the “conversion rule,” as recited in independent claim 18. Accordingly, no combination of Jouet and Najmi would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claim 21 at least by virtue of its dependency from independent claim 18.

Additionally, claim 21 recites that a conversion rule is obtained via a network. Accordingly, since neither Jouet nor Najmi discloses or suggests the use of a “conversion rule,” claim 21 is also believed to be distinguished from Jouet in view of Najmi on its own merit.

In light of the above, the Applicants submit that all the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the outstanding Office Action, and pass the present application to issue. Additionally, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues in the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Hidehiko SHIN et al.

/Mark D. Pratt/

By 2010.03.29 14:21:47 -04'00'

Mark D. Pratt

Registration No. 45,794

Attorney for Applicants

MDP/clw/ats
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
March 29, 2010